Attendees:

Member	Association	Representing
Tareq Al-Zeer	WSDOT NW Region Maintenance and	WSDOT
	Operations	
Holly Glaser	WSDOT NW Region Maintenance and	WSDOT (alternate)
	Operations	
Eric Jessup	Project Manager of the Strategic	Freight
	Freight Transportation Analysis Project	
Nancy Tubbs	US Geological Survey Oregon Liaison	USGS
Chuck Buzzard	Pierce County GIS	West side local government
Linda Gurell	Pierce County GIS (alternate)	West side local government
		(alternate)
Wendy Hawley	US Census Bureau	US Census Bureau
I an Von Essen	Spokane County GIS Manager	E-911
Dave Rideout	Spokane County Engineers GIS Manager	East side local government
Roland Behee	Community Transit of Spokane County	Transit
Jerry Harless	Puget Sound Regional Council	MPO's
Lisa Stuebing	Mason County GIS Manager	West side local government
Carrie Wolfe	Washington Framework Coordinator	In her role as coordinator
Tami Griffin	WSDOT Geographic Services	WS-Trans (Project
		Manager), Facilitator
Elaine Minnaert	WSDOT	Recorder

Not Attending:

Member	Association	Representing
Dave Cullom	Washington Utilities and Transportation	Utilities, Rail, WUTC
	Commission	
Dan Dickson	CRAB	CRAB
Dale Guenther US Regional Ecosystem Office		Federal Land Management
		Agencies
Not filled		East side local government
Not filled	Department of Natural Resources	

Agenda: 1. Introductions

2. Review Action I tems and Status

3. Review Work Plan

4. Determine Meetings Times in Phase I

5. Select Locations for Meetings

Page: 1 9/16/2002

- 6. Report on Business Needs Efforts
- 7. Determine Business Needs Collection Next Steps
- 8. Develop Prioritization Process
- 9. Prioritize Business Needs Already Collected
- 10. Action I tems Review
- 11. Wrap Up

Members were introduced who had not previously attended. Carrie Wolfe was also introduced and her role as the coordinator of all framework projects for Washington.

An action items review was done. A list was made of the various places to have meetings. The following suggestions were listed:

- Central Washington University (video conferencing available)
- Puget Sound Regional Council (downtown Seattle)
- WSDOT Northwest Region (video conferencing available)
- US Census (Key Tower downtown Seattle)
- Pullman or Richland WSU Facilities
- WSU Campus Spokane

Contacts were also discussed. Tami wasn't sure she had gotten a BI A contact and she was missing a military contact. Nancy sent the BI A contact previously (Mike Darling). Jerry Harless suggested Colleen Jolly the WSDOT Tribal Liaison. I an had mentioned a Tribal Council. Eric is trying to get a contact at Association for Washington Cities for Tami.

Dale still needs to send the OGIC requirements. Nancy may have those as well. Nancy and Dale will also try to get the ORBITS work and see if they are included in the business needs document. It was determined that most of the critical business needs had been collected. Eric's still had to be incorporated. Nancy didn't feel the USGS had any additional needs to add. Tami integrated some of the elements from the IRICC data model in the data section that didn't appear elsewhere. Linda referred to those items as CRIS items. That may mean they are covered under CRAB needs. However CRAB hasn't been included because of Dan Dickson's illness. The county representatives strongly expressed a need to have a CRAB representative on the Steering Committee. Also missing from the Business needs was DNR input. Carrie indicated that their road data steward position has to be filled and that would be the correct member. She is trying to find someone to participate at some level until that happens.

Action I tem - Tami contact Dan Dickson and request that he assign and alternate until he is well enough to step back in.

Action I tem - Tami update the Action I tem document from this meeting and send it out.

Page: 2 9/16/2002

The work plan was evaluated. Linda felt the section on developing data agreements was premature. If a pilot hasn't been done than you don't know what the agreements involve, particularly which data, how often, etc. She felt that section could be replaced with a section about "framing components of a data sharing agreement". She identified things such as accuracy, consistency, standards, policy on secondary destinations. It was suggested that looking at existing data sharing agreements when the time comes is a good idea. Linda will assist Tami with identifying those tasks.

Action I tem – Tami will move the section on developing data agreements to in the pilot and actual implementation section and rework the other section using Linda to provide feedback.

The meeting schedule was discussed and the group agreed to meet every six weeks as opposed to identifying meeting times based on the work plan. Meeting dates for most the next year were set up. Locations were established for the first three meetings. They are as follows:

	Meeting Date	Location	Responsible for Setting Up
•	September 30, 2002	Spokane	Eric with assistance from I an and Dave
•	November 18, 2002	Seattle WSDOT	Tareq will set up
•	January 6, 2002	Olympia	Tami will set up

- February 17
- March 31
- May 12
- June 23

All meetings will be held from 9 a.m. – 2 p.m.

Action I tem – Responsible parties will schedule meeting facilities and find a recorder to assist with the meeting.

Action I tem - Tami will facilitate car-pooling to the Spokane meeting.

I an made a comment about I -Teams and how critical they will be to getting Federal funding in the future. He shared that Washington's efforts at I -Teams is very rudimentary because our WAGIC is totally volunteer. However the work we are doing can be incorporated into an I -Plan and we will need to start thinking about that. He and Tami will be discussing it offline over lunch.

Tami shared what she has done since the last meeting. She met with Pierce County and got a lot of very useful ideas from Linda and Chuck, which she is working on. She also met with Donna Wendt from the city of Tacoma. Donna mentioned how important resolving having

Page: 3 9/16/2002

the "snap" the roads on TIGER is. That is a big carrot for Tacoma. Linda gave Tami contact information for Eric Haldeman of King County Emergency Management and she met with him. They have done a Project Lifeline that consists of critical infrastructure in an emergency and roads between them. This project would really benefit from WATrans. Tami also met with the City of Seattle Public Utilities and Department of Transportation people. They are developing a new data model and standard and are interested in our effort. Tami also attended the URISA Street Smarts and Address Savvy where she met someone from the Hopi Nation who mentioned that the BIA is doing a roads inventory on tribal lands right now. Linda suggested contacting the Fire Districts. If anyone has contact information about Fire Districts that would help.

Action I tems – If anyone has a contact with a Fire District that would be appropriate please provide that to Tami. Tami will contact Eric Haldeman to see if he can provide a contact.

There was a lot of discussion of prioritization. There was some miscommunication about this. Linda felt it was too early to do prioritization. What was decided was that individual organizations priorities for business needs should be gathered and used but priorities on data and functionality would be determined once we have extracted those needs.

Linda suggested a process for determining functionality that WA-Trans must support and data that would be included. She suggested that once that had been done the prioritization process would be clearer and easier. Her suggestion involved the use of different spreadsheets for processing this information. Here is an outline of the process Linda recommended:

Matrices will be developed. They will include the following information:

- 1. Business need defined by functionality needed to support that function in a GIS. Functionalities were defined as follows: View (V), Query (Q), Locate (L), Identify/Report (I), Geocode (G), Route (R), Map Production (MP), Dispatch (D), Modeling (M), 3-D (3), Spatial Analysis (S), Allocation (A). A first cut of this spreadsheet was developed during the meeting. A definition of these functions needs to be written out.
- 2. Business needs and the data needed to support those needs.
- 3. Data defined by source, accuracy, completeness, currency and possibly others as determined.

Page: 4 9/16/2002

4. Partners priority for business needs based upon the 1 to 5 rating determined at the July 16 steering committee meeting.

These spreadsheets can be used to determine a variety of information but will be hard to develop and maintain. Linda volunteered Chuck Buzzard to develop an application on the Internet which will allow individual steering committee members to add their own information which can then be downloaded into a spreadsheet for Tami to use. There will be no security on these applications but only steering committee members will get the URL for the applications.

Action I tem - Tami will send the spreadsheets to Linda and Chuck.

Action I tem - Chuck will develop an Internet application to support the process.

Action I tem - First cut of definitions for item 1 above (Members send in, Tami sends out for feedback)

Tami made one more request of the members. She is working on a proposal for homeland security money. In order to have any possibility of getting funding prior to the end of this Federal fiscal year she needs to get it in next week. She is assuming that anRFP will be written and consulting company would develop the first release of WATrans to get it done on time. However, we need to determine our in-kind contribution. Tami asked each steering committee member to send her the following:

- 1. Time spent in the last month working on WA-Trans as a steering committee member.
- 2. Any travel costs and travel time
- 3. Time spent as a partner over the last quarter.
- 4. Best estimate for preparing data and answering questions for your constituency with routing, dispatch, address geocoding, street centerline.

Action I tems - Steering Committee members provide Tami with the needed information.

A review of the meeting was done. The positive items are listed in the + column and the items that should be changed are listed in the Δ column.

+	D
Valuable discussion	Concern that meeting time
	should be later (overruled)
Meeting moved well	
Good time was kept	
The detailed agenda	
with time provided was	
helpful	
Good organization	

Page: 5 9/16/2002

The parking lot included one item that hadn't been discussed. That was the use of telephone calls for action items.

Page: 6 9/16/2002